Dear Jim, SBC JFK Aassassination Show 3/27-8/75 3/28/75

As a work of propaganda and as entertainment this was probably a very successful show. It may also generate enormous pressures for a re-investigation. As a vechile for information it was deficient at its best moments. My hunch is that the reaction to the showing of the Z film was so great they wanted to do it again and built the show around it.

The propaganda was not all against the conclusions of the Report, however. Three of the characters pinned responsibility for suppression on the Kennedys. None mentioned FBI in any way except that Frazier tried out the gun and timed it.

The amount of simple factual error is staggering. They all had Finck in direct charge of the autopsy, as one example, and suppression for 25 years, whatever that comes from for another.

Wyril got his free malpractise publicity because nobody knows any of the fact. But it was a performance remarkable for its emptiness. He is still hollering for that "hard evidence" missing from the Archives (I never knew it to be there).

Somebody decided in advance on a very simply formula and stuck to it. The evidence addressed was quite simple. Tink Thompson was built up into the big investigator who had brought it all to light when he was Life's investigator. Actually he presented nothing not in Whitewash much earlier except that he used a picture I didn't. So the net gives Geis Associates a fat plug.

There was other payola, not only to Life and Geis and the participants. The most disgusting to me was Gregory in a stereotyped Uncle Tom-Stepin Fetchit manner simpering that if there is an investigation a tape of that show has to be their first evidence. So there was payola to ABC, too. And to Gregory, credited with being the man who did it all.

I did tape the show and I did make a few notes I'm not bothering to type and may not be able to read later. But could I have fun before a seminar of some kind on what it takes to be an expert and how to rip off people's minds! Play that tape and stop every little while with a correction in simple fact.

My estimates were essentially correct. I erred in not imagining the show would have as little of what was aired 10 years ago as it did. Not only nothing new: very little of the old. This and total avoidance of the allocation of blame against any of ABC's fat cats is probably what got the net behind it, witness their plug on yesterday's a.m. newscast. I'll watch this a.m.'s.

I was quite correct in saying I represent a responsible and entirelt different point of view. It is not a simple matter of the Report was right or wrong, and that is all the show considered or the guests represent. I was right to send certified letters (last night I heard Delaney from Vietnam!) and to send the complaint prior to the airing because that will lead them to dismiss it as a personal complaint and not to believe that there is another view to be aired. I'll now do nothing but we'll have this in reserve for future use. Unless they plan another show soon.

It will, of course, be simple to tick off all the vast differences between the view I represent and have always represented and what they aired should there be the occasion and to specify how they deceived people. It is now more apparent why they did not want me on the show while using nothing that I did not use first by far and did copyright except for Cyril's amazing nonsense. Even the demand for a Congressional investigation is in one book only:WW I. (It is because I was sure they would keep it simple, if not this simple, that I made the remarks about cooyright and current damage.) However, it also mat generate competitive interest, as I think I noted yesterday. With the simplicity and the emptiness of the opposition and the ability to blame only the wrong people formulae exist. We'll have to wait and see. Hastily,